



ROPES & GRAY LLP
PRUDENTIAL TOWER
800 BOYLSTON STREET
BOSTON, MA 02199-3600
WWW.ROPESGRAY.COM

July 24, 2025

Peter L. Welsh
T +1 617 951 7865
peter.welsh@ropesgray.com

BY ECF

The Honorable Barbara Moses
United States District Court for the Southern District of New York
Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse
500 Pearl St.
New York, NY 10007-1312

Re: *Livevideo.AI Corp. v. Redstone, et al.*, C.A. No. 1:24-cv-06290-DEH-BCM (S.D.N.Y.)

Dear Judge Moses:

Defendant National Amusements, Inc. (“NAI”) respectfully submits this letter in response to Plaintiff Livevideo.AI Corp.’s (“Livevideo”) July 17, 2025 filing, styled as a “Request for Judicial Notice” (the “Request”) (Dkt. 156), in which Livevideo seeks to improperly supplement its pending June 21, 2025 Motion to Revoke Referral (the “Motion”) (Dkt. 147). Respectfully, the Court should disregard the Request.

To start, the Request is untimely, as it seeks to supplement the record in support of the Motion after that filing has been fully briefed and submitted to the Court. *See* Request at 1. Briefing on the Motion was complete on July 14, 2025—the date that Livevideo filed its reply brief pursuant to Local Rule 6.1(b). However, on July 17, Livevideo filed the Request without seeking or receiving leave from this Court. Livevideo offers no explanation for its belated submission, nor could it. The three documents referenced in the Request are dated June 23, July 9, and July 8, 2025—all well before Livevideo’s deadline to reply. And Livevideo cannot claim that it only recently discovered this evidence, as the three documents were *submitted by Livevideo* to the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”). The Request should be disregarded on this procedural basis alone. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(B) (requiring a showing of excusable neglect to extend an expired deadline).

Even if the Request was procedurally proper, the documents attached to the Request are completely irrelevant to Livevideo’s Motion. The Request seeks judicial notice of certain statements in documents that Livevideo—or its known vexatious-litigant CEO Brad Greenspan—authored and submitted to the FCC. Request at 1, 5–14. None of these filings or statements are relevant to the issue of whether the Court should rescind the referral or Your Honor should be recused, and “[c]ourts need not take judicial notice of irrelevant facts or documents.” *Novartis Pharma AG v. Incyte Corp.*, --- F. Supp. 3d ---, No. 1:20-cv-400, 2025 WL 1030018, at *10 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 6, 2025) (quotation omitted) (collecting cases).

ROPES & GRAY LLP

The Honorable Barbara Moses

- 2 -

July 24, 2025

At bottom, the Request is Livevideo's latest effort to prolong its harassment of NAI and abuse the Court's time and resources by continuing to circumvent court rules and make frivolous filings. Accordingly, NAI continues to seek the relief sought in its currently pending motion for sanctions (Dkt. 120) and its letter-motion for a stay of further briefing (Dkt. 144) in order to deter and prevent further vexatious conduct.

Counsel for NAI remains available for a status conference at the Court's convenience to the extent it would aid resolution of this or any other issues. NAI appreciates the Court's continued attention to this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Peter L. Welsh

Peter L. Welsh

cc: Counsel of Record (via ECF)

434/2,000 words